

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

JAN 05 2006

32692

Customer Number

Patent  
Case No.: 59529US002

## IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

First Named Inventor: WINDORSKI, DAVID C.

Application No.: 10/772190

Group Art Unit: 1771

Filed: February 4, 2004

Examiner: Desai, Anish P.

Title: ARTICLE WITH SELECTIVELY ACTIVATED ADHESIVE

RESPONSE TO RESTRICTION REQUIREMENTMail Stop Amendment  
Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING OR TRANSMISSION [37 CFR § 1.8(a)]	
I hereby certify that this correspondence is being:	
<input type="checkbox"/>	deposited with the United States Postal Service on the date shown below with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	transmitted by facsimile on the date shown below to the United States Patent and Trademark Office at 571-273-8300.
1-5-06	<i>2 pages</i> <i>Joyce M. Courtney</i>
Date	Signed by: Joyce M. Courtney

Dear Sir:

This is in response to the Office Action mailed December 8, 2005. Claims 1-20 are pending. Claims 1-20 were restricted under 35 USC § 121 as follows:

- I. Claims 1-6 are said to be drawn to an article which may be selectively secured to a mounting substrate, classified in Class 428, subclass various;
- II. Claims 7-20 are said to be drawn to an index card assembly, classified in Class , subclass various;

Election

In response, Applicants elect Group II, with traverse.

Reconsideration and withdrawal or modification of the restriction requirement is respectfully requested.

In Group II. Applicants broadly claim an index card assembly.

The Restriction Requirement in Paragraphs 1 and 2 state that the inventions of Group I and II are distinct for various reasons.

Applicants submit that the Groups I and II claims are so interrelated that a search of one group of claims will reveal art to the other. Moreover, the classification of Groups I and II claims in different classes and subclasses is not necessarily sufficient grounds to require restriction.

Application No.: 10/772190

Case No.: 59529US002

Were restriction to be effected between the claims in Groups I and II, a separate examination of the claims in Groups I and II would require substantial duplication of work on the part of the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office. Even though some additional consideration would be necessary, the scope of analysis of novelty of all the claims of Groups I and II would have to be as rigorous as when only the claims of Group II were being considered by themselves. Clearly, this duplication of effort would not be warranted where these claims of different categories are so interrelated. Further, Applicants submit that for restriction to be effected between the claims in Groups I and II, it would place an undue burden by requiring payment of a separate filing fee for examination of the nonelected claims, as well as the added costs associated with prosecuting two applications and maintaining two patents.

#### Conclusion

Applicants have elected Group II. Continued prosecution of this application is respectfully requested.

It is believed that no fee is due; however, in the event a fee is required, please charge the fee to Deposit Account No. 13-3723. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the indicated telephone number with questions that can be resolved with a simple teleconference.

Respectfully submitted,

05 January 2006  
Date

By: Yen Tong Florczak  
Yen Tong Florczak, Reg. No.: 45,163  
Telephone No.: 651-737-0710

Office of Intellectual Property Counsel  
3M Innovative Properties Company  
Facsimile No.: 651-736-3833